



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

Since the publication of my edition of Pindar's Olympian and Pythian Odes in 1885 much has been written about the dates of Pindar's poems and much new light has been thrown on the subject by recent discoveries, by the finding of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία, by the resurrection of Bakchylides, by the bringing out of the Oxyrhynchos papyri, as may be seen by an inspection of the bibliography prefixed to M. CAMILLE GASPAR'S *Essai de chronologie pindarique* (Brussels, 1890); and he who edits Pindar to-day must needs reconsider point after point. The main complaint that M. GASPAR has to make against the recent editors of Pindar is the adherence to the Boeckhian date of the first Pythian, in which the illustrious master followed Pausanias, and not the scholiast, and made the Pythian era begin with Ol. 48, 3, and not Ol. 49, 3. What Pausanias (X 7, 3) calls the ἀγὼν στεφανίτης was really the first Pythiad, and this is borne out by the evidence of the three documents already referred to in regard to P. I and VII, O. I, IX, XII. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Otto Schroeder, Pomtow, Baumstark are all on the side of Bergk, who in his third and fourth editions returned resolutely to the date which had been accepted before Boeckh, and M. GASPAR undertakes to show that a sane interpretation of the Pythians is only possible on the assumption of the Bergkian date, the date of the old system.

When the introduction of M. GASPAR'S *Essai* was written, Fraccaroli and Bornemann alone of the recent Pindarists had been faithful to Ol. 49, 3, but while the book was in press there appeared OTTO SCHROEDER'S fifth edition of BERGK'S *Pindar*. SCHROEDER is, as we have seen, an advocate of the Bergkian date, but could only make use of the Oxyrhynchos papyri in his *Addenda et Corrigenda*. Thus he has been brought nearer to an agreement with M. GASPAR at some points, but M. GASPAR, in a tone which seems to be borrowed from the Germans, says that he has found nothing in SCHROEDER that was calculated to modify his own conclusions.

Into the details of these conclusions I can not enter here, not for lack of interest, nor for lack of appreciation of the importance of these chronological studies. In his *History of Sicily* (II 267),

Mr. Freeman is not hazarding much when he says: 'It would be a real gain to historic truth to print the *Epinikia* of Pindar in chronological order.' But when Mr. Freeman wrote the time for that had not come, and even M. GASPAR himself only hopes 'that the day is not far distant when an agreement more or less definitive will be reached as to the dates of the different odes of Pindar. When that day comes it is to be wished that some editor may be bold enough to break once for all with tradition and routine, and print the odes of Pindar in chronological order.' Such an order would be, as Mr. Freeman insists, a gain to history: it would also be a gain to the study of the poet's art. M. Alfred Croiset has well said, and his words are quoted by M. Gaspar, that 'an ode of Pindar is not a work of pure imagination, created arbitrarily by the enthusiasm of a dreamer. It stands in direct and necessary relation to the circumstances in which it is produced'; and in my way I have insisted much on the character of the odes as occasional poems. But the subtle webs that have been woven between Pindar and his times seemed to me, during the years of my Pindaric studies, so gauzy—not to say, flimsy—that I was haunted by the dictum of Friedrichs, which has been so energetically scouted by those commentators who have wrought most on the historical side. Hence I rebelled against what I could not but regard as the overdoing of historical interpretation, and to me the poems themselves seemed to hold what was essential to the enjoyment of the poetry. Still there is danger in pushing the dogma too far, and, doubtless, I ought to have attacked that side of my task more seriously. As I have just said, the study of the growth of Pindaric art—in which every devotee of poetry must take delight—would gain greatly if we could fix, by historical data, the succession of the odes. But what do we find even after the *Essai de chronologie pindarique*?

The early date of the Tenth Pythian, the late date of the Eighth, give us two fixed points, and much has been made of the signs of youth in the one, of old age in the other. But what of the culmination? 476, the year of O. I, II, III, was a glorious year for Pindar. But the pinion of the Theban eagle sustained him for many years at the soaring height of his genius, and we hesitate to call 476 his apogee, though, if we accept the Bergkian date of his birth, 476 is not far from the conventional ἀκμή, the conventional *floruit* of forty years. P. I, which is put in 470, is unsurpassed. O. VII and O. XIII, assigned to 464, are full of masculine, not of feverish, vigor. At sixty Pindar took his longest flight, in P. IV; and P. V recalls the movement of O. II. For my part, I have not been able to recognize the symptoms of aging in Pindar, which Leopold Schmidt has dwelt upon in such detail. P. VIII is bitter, or, if you choose, austere, but the melancholy of the latest piece is matched by the melancholy of

the earliest, as I have noted elsewhere. The shadow is as long in the morning as in the afternoon. But M. GASPARD will not allow P. X to be the earliest, nor P. VIII the latest, of Pindar's poems. According to him, I. VII and [N.] X beside the famous fragment precede the one and [N.] XI follows the other. It is interesting to find that in fixing the date of I. VII M. GASPARD shows a certain happiness in the support of Graff's metrical tests, for which he has shown scant respect elsewhere.

In his *Essai sur la rhétorique grecque* (Hachette), M. OCTAVE NAVARRE has endeavored to trace the lines of connection along which rhetorical studies were transmitted from Sicily to Athens. In this chapter his main source is Diodoros. Thereupon follows a detailed account of the teaching of the sophists, with many of whom rhetoric was the be-all and end-all. In regard to Gorgias M. NAVARRE despairs of saying anything new, and after cataloguing the so-called innovations of the Leontine sophist, he undertakes to show that the Gorgianic figures had their root in the poets that preceded him. Diels had already compared Gorgias and Empedokles; but M. NAVARRE contends that Epicharmos abounds in Gorgianic tricks of style, even more than does Empedokles. For that matter, Aischylos exhibits most of the figures to which Gorgias has attached his name; and in Sophokles these figures are no longer an accessory ornament, but are of the very weft of his style. Indeed, M. NAVARRE would have no difficulty in proving that all the elements of rhetoric are floating in poetry from the beginning. He next attempts to recover from the remains of Antiphon the principles of his *τέχνη*, which dominates all the rhetoric of his century and beyond. In this M. NAVARRE is not embarrassed by questions of genuineness, and if he were, the fact that all the extant orations show the same controlling technique would have dissipated his doubts. Isokrates, who represents the next stage, introduces the Socratic method, and is called 'the last and the most finished representative of practical rhetoric, such as it was conceived at Athens down to Aristotle.'

The second part of the work consists of an attempt to reconstruct a *τέχνη* of the fourth century B. C. The substance of it has come down to us in the early Latin treatises in the *ad Herennium* and the *de Inventione*, blended, it is true, with other elements, yet not beyond the possibility of disengagement; and the influence of the *τέχνη* on the composition of the speech was even more profound than has been supposed. Every Greek speech was under its domination. The treatise closes with a strong plea for the rehabilitation of rhetoric, which, according to M. NAVARRE, is fallen into unmerited neglect in modern France.

M. NAVARRE has not burdened his volume with a bibliography, and the references to modern authorities seldom go outside the familiar manuals. Of course, no one is to be blamed for overlooking dissertations, and the readers of Mr. Freeman's Sicily will remember with indulgence his testy remarks on that subject; but sometimes it seems a pity that so much youthful enthusiasm and diligence should be like water spilled on the ground, and M. NAVARRE's book reminds me of a Johns Hopkins dissertation of 1891 by J. C. ROBERTSON, *On the Gorgianic Figures in Early Greek Prose*, which might have given M. NAVARRE some points as to the world-wide influence of Gorgias.

M. NAVARRE's complimentary reference to the *Littérature grecque* of M. ALFRED CROISSET, to whom his book is dedicated, sent me back to the fourth volume of this excellent work, which deals with the Attic orators, among other things, and in rereading it I find, under the head of Antiphon (p. 78), the following remark: '[Antiphon] remplace le verbe usuel par un substantif verbal qui exprime la même idée d'une manière plus neuve et par conséquent plus frappante.' I hope that I shall be pardoned for declining to consider this one of the 'pénétrantes observations' for which M. NAVARRE gives M. ALFRED CROISSET credit. The periphrases mean something more than novelty, something more even than *δγκος*, as I have set forth in A. J. P. XVI 525, XX 111; and a good illustration of the ethical effect, of the impressive lesson that character is the result of action, is given by Andokides, I 19: ἐλεξαν ὡς ἐγὼ μηνύσαιμι περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων (which were bad enough) καὶ γενοίμην μηνυτῆς (horror of horrors!) κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἑμαντοῦ. This example is all the more interesting because it occurs in the least rhetorical of the orators, one whose Greek is not sicklied o'er by reflection. Less striking and yet quite apposite is an example furnished by Antiphon himself, I 11: ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι τοῦτο μὲν ὁ θέλων αὐτὸς βασανιστῆς γενέσθαι (character), τοῦτο δὲ <ὁ> τούτους αὐτοὺς κελεύων βασανίσαι (mere act) ἀντ' ἐμοῦ. Comp. Aisch. Ag. 225: ἔτλα δ' οὐδ' θυτὴρ γενέσθαι θυγατρός. But the force of similar periphrases is evident enough in English—as in Shakespeare's 'neither a borrower nor a lender be,' and Ben Jonson's 'If thou beest more, thou art an understander, and then I trust thee.'

That indispensable companion of the student of Greek grammar, MEISTERHANS, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften* (Weidmann), has appeared in an enlarged and revised edition, under the care of EDUARD SCHWYZER, of Zurich. The enlargement, as the new editor frankly confesses, pertains chiefly to the sounds and the inflections, which have gained sixty pages, whereas

the syntax has gained only five. As in the preceding edition, little use has been made of syntactical research in other than inscriptional directions, and the student has been left to draw his own conclusions, though a few words would often have sufficed to mark the difference between the rigidity of legal language and the easy play of prose literature. How far, for instance, the orators were subdued to what they worked in is an interesting question, one side of which was attacked by Fuhr as far back as 1878 in the *Rh. Mus.* XXXIII 583. Fuhr's statistics seem to need revision, but it is not without significance that the orators, like the inscriptions, make comparatively scant use of *τε καί*. This coincidence in usage may well be attributed, as he attributes it, to the official character of oratorical discourse. As for *τε—τε*, MEISTERHANS declares that it is never used in Attic ISS, but the orators use it more freely than one would suppose from Madvig's sharp statement (§485, Anm. 3), though, characteristically enough, unpractical Isokrates is the one who indulges most in the combination.

He who should formulate immediate action for the aorist imperative in prose, and repeated action for the present infinitive, as MEISTERHANS resolutely does for the ISS, would have to force the phenomena (A. J. P. XIII 424); the statistics of Weber show that *ἵνα* has not vanished from the orators as it has practically done from the ISS; and *οἶτος* and *οἶδε* in Attic prose refuse to be bound by the inscriptional law of 'preceding' and 'succeeding' as laid down by MEISTERHANS. The language of the courts, after all, did not dye off much on the texture of the orators, and we must distinguish between the occasional use of a consecrated formula and the habitual set of professional language. But I must content myself here with transcribing from my copy of MEISTERHANS' second edition to my copy of the third (for which I am duly grateful), one or two of the marginal notes. Under §84, 3 d), there is an earlier example of a nominative in a catalogue than any given by Meisterhans: CIA. I 170-73 (422-19 B. C.). See Hicks, No. 50. On *ἀρετῆς οὐνεκα καὶ φιλίας* (p. 216), Wilamowitz-Möllendorff remarks on H. F.¹ 155: 'Dies denkmal einer hetäre ist plebejisch.' The reference to Dittenberger (p. 257) should be *Hermes*, XVI 337, and as SCHWYZER has done me the honor of citing my article on the Article with Proper Names (p. 222), I wish he had given the right volume of the *Journal*, which is XI 483. An odd persistency of a false accentuation is to be noted on p. 203, bottom, where read *ἀγκυραι*.

Professor OSTHOFF'S *Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen* deals with the so-called defective words, such as 'good,' which lacks a comparative and superlative, and 'better,' which

lacks a positive, with *fero*, which stops at the present stem, and *tuli*, which serves as a perfect to *fero*. For this phenomenon 'suppletory' or 'suppletive' is a better term than 'defective,' and the questions that rise from the study of these associated groups are of wide and deep interest. Why we say 'bull' and 'cow,' why we say 'horse' and 'mare,' and not 'he-horse' and 'she-horse,' as a German professor of English fancied we did; why the so-called conjugation of *τίπτω* shifts so often; why *φίλος* has so many comparatives, and no satisfactory one; why the particular becomes generic; why now this side and now that is turned out,—these are problems that have not escaped the thoughtful teacher, and have attracted the student of language for many years; but the scattered phenomena become much more intelligible by a collective treatment at the hands of an acknowledged master, such as OSTHOFF, who has made over an academic address into a scientific treatise.

Beginning with vol. XI, Harvard University has assumed the publication of *The Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, and henceforth subscriptions should be sent to the Publication Agent, 2 University Hall, Cambridge, Mass. Contents of vol. XI: *De Rebus ad Pompas Sacras apud Graecos pertinentibus Quaestiones Selectae quas instituit* ARTHURUS G. LEACOCK; *Oriental Cults in Britain*, by CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE; *The Form of Nominal Compounds in Latin*, by GEORGE D. CHASE; *Conjectural Emendations of the Homeric Hymns*, by WALTON BROOKS MCDANIEL; *The Death of Ajax: on an Etruscan Mirror in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston*, by EDMUND VON MACH; *Notes on the Worship of the Roman Emperors in Spain*, by GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE; *Συγγενής ὀφθαλμός*, by JOSIAH BRIDGE; *Ancient Roman Curb Bits*, by ROBERT EMMONS LEE; *Notes on the Phormio*, by H. W. HAYLEY; *Epigraphica*, by MINTON WARREN; *Indexes*. A word or two on the Pindaric article by Mr. BRIDGE. According to Mr. BRIDGE no change is to be made in the text of P. 5, 17: *συγγενής* is 'kindred,' not 'native,' *ὀφθαλμός* is not metaphorical, but literal, and *συγγενής ὀφθαλμός*, as written out, is really *ὀφθαλμός συγγενούς πότμου*. The Destiny of the Race is personified, and the Eye of that Destiny is on the members of the family. One is reminded not only of Pindar's *δέρκεται* (P. 3, 85) and *ἐποπτεύει* (O. 7, 11), but also of the Psalmist's 'The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous,' *ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δίκαιον* (Ps. xxxiv. 16). The word used, be it noted, is not *ῥμμα*, but *ὀφθαλμός*, and Mr. BRIDGE insists on J. H. H. Schmidt's distinction. *ὀφθαλμός* is not a jewel, like *ῥμμα*—it is a guiding star. For my part, I find myself unable to accept Schmidt's pretty distinction, and am still unconvinced by his labored attempt to sustain that distinction in the face of Aischylos, Persae 168: *ἀμφὶ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖς φόβος* | *ῥμμα γὰρ δόμων νομίζω δεσπότην παρουσίαν*. In order to be fair to Schmidt, I have kept the MS reading *ὀφθαλμοῖς*, but the passage evidently

points to Xerxes (ἀμφὶ τῷ Ξέρξῃ, Schol. rec.); and with this interpretation we must read after Heimsoeth, followed by Weil and Wecklein, ὀφθαλμῷ. But Mr. BRIDGE sticks to the Schmidtian limitation of ὀφθαλμός, and in the Pindaric passage he gives us the Eye of Destiny, the Masonic Eye, with its perpetual stare, the Eye of the Great King, which winks at us from the Acharnians. As I have said in my commentary on the ode that 'God appears here as πότμος,' I might be expected to favor Mr. BRIDGE's interpretation. But somehow the figure of Pseudartabas intrudes, and I am affected by Mr. BRIDGE's Eye of the Destiny of the Race somewhat as Aristophanes seems to have been by the Euripidean 'Foot of Time.'

Professor MICHEL BRÉAL's interesting and important *Essai de Sémantique*, to which attention was called at the time of its appearance (A. J. P. XVIII 368), has been translated into English by Mrs. HENRY CUST, under the title *Semantics* (Henry Holt). M. BRÉAL's book deserves the compliment of a translation, but while Mrs. CUST was about it, she might have taken the pains to translate the titles of German books cited by M. Bréal into their original tongue. It is droll to read in an English book of Grimm, *Grammaire*, of Cauer, *Programme du Gymnase de Hamm*, of the *Journal de Kuhn*. As all English-speaking philologists are presumed to know French, the translation is a work of supererogation for the public of this Journal, and for us the *raison d'être* of the book must be the long Preface by Professor POSTGATE (vii-lix) and the appendix by the same scholar 'On the Science of Meaning.'

G. C. K.: Within the last few years a new worker in Greek fable literature has appeared upon the scene in the person of Dr. MICHELE MARCHIANÒ, whose latest book is entitled *L'Origine della Favola Greca e i suoi Rapporti con le Favole Orientali* (Trani, V. Vecchi, 1900. 8vo, xii and 504 pp.). His treatment of the subject is rather superficial but popular in its nature, and the result is a very readable monograph covering a very wide field. After discussing numerous theories as to the origin of the Aesopic fable, he decides in favor of the Greeks. The book is well printed upon good paper with clear type, but extreme inattention to proofreading has produced some startling results, and a strong tendency to normalize the names of modern foreign scholars according to the principles of Italian orthography is evinced by the author.

The appearance of the first fascicle of the great *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, announced in the advertising pages, is an event in philological circles. A detailed account of it is promised for the next number of the Journal.